

**Remarks**

**Amendments to the claims**

The claims have been amended to make claim 1 depend from broader claim 21.

Claims 2-20 have been canceled without prejudice and solely to expedite prosecution. Applicant reserves the right to pursue this subject matter in continuation or divisional applications.

No new matter is introduced by these amendments.

**Restriction Requirement**

In the Office Action a restriction requirement was made under 35 USC §121 between the following groups of claims:

- |          |                                                                                                                                                                           |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Group I  | Claims 1-30 (in part), drawn to compounds of formula I or formula II (wherein W, X, Y, and Z are all carbon atoms (i.e., quinazolinone); T and U are covalent bonds); and |
| Group II | Claims 21-30 (in part), drawn to compounds of formula II (that is not a substituted quinazolinone, T and U are not covalent bonds simultaneously).                        |

Applicant provisionally elects the subject matter of Group II (Claims 21-30) with traverse. The right to pursue non-elected subject matter in one or more divisional applications is expressly reserved.

The inventions of Groups I-II have been categorized as distinct because the “core piperazinyl ring ... does not sufficiently define the invention because it is well known in the art” and because searching “multiple compounds of the two distinct inventions would indeed impose a serious burden upon the examiner....”

MPEP §803 mandates two criteria for a proper restriction requirement:

“(A) The inventions must be independent (see MPEP §802.01, §806.04, §808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP §806.05 - §806.05(i)); and

(B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP §803.02, §806.04(a)-§806.04(i), §808.01(a), and §808.02).” (Emphasis added.)

Applicant submits the present restriction requirement is improper. Each of the pending claims recites a Markush compound genus. Fragmentation of a Markush compound genus through the use of a restriction requirement is improper because it is inconsistent with the applicable case law and contrary to the express directions given by the Patent Office's stated guidelines for restriction of Markush groups as set forth in MPEP §803.02.

Specifically, in *In re Weber*, 580 F.2d 455, 198 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1978), the court articulated the general proposition that:

[A]n applicant has a right to have each claim examined on the merits. If an applicant submits a number of claims, it may well be that pursuant to a proper restriction requirement, those claims will be dispersed to a number of applications. Such action would not affect the right of the applicant eventually to have each of the claims examined in the form he considers to best define his invention. If, however, a single claim is required to be divided up and presented in several applications, that claim would never be considered on its merits. The totality of the resulting fragmentary claims would not necessarily be the equivalent of the original claim. Further, since the subgenera would be defined by the examiner rather than by the applicant, it is not inconceivable that a number of the fragments would not be described in the specification. *Id.* at 331. (Emphasis added).

Restated in a more recent opinion from the Federal Circuit in *In re Watkinson*, 900 F.2d 230, 14 USPQ2d 1407 (Fed Cir. 1990) at page 1409:

Under *In re Weber*, 580 F.2d 455, 198 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1978) and *In re Haas*, 580 F.2d 461, 198 USPQ 334, it is never proper for an examiner to reject a Markush claim under 35 U.S.C. § 121. *Id.* Section 121 simply does not authorize such a rejection.\*\*\*[W]ith regard to section 121, the rejection of a Markush claim is different from a restriction requirement between different claims. (Emphasis in original, citations omitted)

In view of the case law, the Patent Office has set forth the following general policy regarding restriction of Markush-type claims in MPEP §803.02:

Since the decisions in *In re Weber*, 580 F.2d 455, 198 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1978) and *In re Haas*, 580 F.2d 461, 198 USPQ 334, it is improper for the Office to refuse to examine that which applicants regard as their invention, unless the subject matter in a claim lacks unity of invention. *In re Harnish*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); and *Ex parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984).

In the present case, the Examiner's use of a "restriction requirement" to force Applicant to limit the genus to one of the "inventions" within the scope of the Markush group when the compounds share a common utility and have a common nucleus, is clearly improper in view of the applicable case law and the stated policy of the Patent Office. In determining the propriety of a Markush grouping each compound must be considered as a whole and should not be broken down into elements or other components. While the Patent Office is allowed to reject a Markush claim based on the judicially created doctrine of improper Markush group based on lack of unity of

invention, such a rejection would not be proper in the present case because the claimed compounds all share a substantial structural feature which is disclosed as being essential to at least one disclosed utility (See, *In re Harnish, supra* at 305; and *Ex parte Hozumi, supra* at 1060.). Specifically, the claimed compounds all have the similar core structure of piperazinyl. In addition all of the compounds within the genus share the common utility of inhibiting KSP and of treating diseases associated with KSP, such as disorders associated with cellular proliferation.

Because the Office Action has improperly required Applicant to limit the genus to one of the "inventions" within the scope of a proper Markush grouping, Applicant submits the Restriction Requirement is improper and should therefore be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

For the reasons set forth above, examination and allowance of the claims of this application are earnestly solicited.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Date: June 1, 2005

By:   
Julie L. Heinrich  
Reg. No. 48,070